

ON THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN RANK- $(n-1)$ CONVEXITY AND $\mathcal{S}$ -QUASICONVEXITY

MARIAPIA PALOMBARO

SISSA

Via Beirut 2-4, 34014 Trieste, Italy

Email: palombar@sisssa.it

ABSTRACT. We prove that rank- $(n-1)$ convexity does not imply $\mathcal{S}$ -quasiconvexity (i.e., quasiconvexity with respect to divergence free fields) in $\mathbb{M}^{m \times n}$ for $m > n$, by adapting the well-known Šverák's counterexample [5] to the solenoidal setting. On the other hand, we also remark that rank- $(n-1)$ convexity and $\mathcal{S}$ -quasiconvexity turn out to be equivalent in the space of $n \times n$ diagonal matrices. This follows by a generalization of Müller's work [4].

Key words: $\mathcal{A}$ -quasiconvexity, lower semicontinuity, solenoidal fields.

2000 Mathematics Subject Classification: 49J45.

1. INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this note is to generalize some known results about the relationship between rank-one convexity and quasiconvexity to the context of divergence free fields. This is motivated by the lower semicontinuity results provided by Fonseca and Müller ([2], Theorems 3.6-3.7). Let us recall the relevant definitions. A function $f : \mathbb{M}^{m \times n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ on the $m \times n$ matrices is called rank-one convex if it is convex on each rank-one line, i.e., for every $A, Y \in \mathbb{M}^{m \times n}$ with $\text{rank}(Y) = 1$, the function $t \rightarrow f(A + tY)$ is convex. It is quasiconvex if

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}^n} f(A + \nabla \varphi) dx \geq f(A),$$

for all $A \in \mathbb{M}^{m \times n}$ and for all $\mathbb{T}^n$ -periodic functions $\varphi \in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{R}^m)$, where $\mathbb{T}^n := (0, 1)^n$. Quasiconvexity implies rank-one convexity. Whether the converse is true for $m = 2$ and $n \geq 2$ is an outstanding open problem. In the higher dimensional case $m \geq 3$, Šverák's counterexample [5] shows that rank-one convexity is not the same as quasiconvexity. On the other hand, Müller [4] proved that the two notions are equivalent for 2×2 diagonal matrices. See also [1], [3] for further generalizations.

In the spirit of $\mathcal{A}$ -quasiconvexity (see, e.g., [2]), we provide in this note the counterpart of these results in the context of divergence free fields. The corresponding notion of quasiconvexity for solenoidal fields, that we call $\mathcal{S}$ -quasiconvexity, is defined as follows.

Definition 1.1. A function $f : \mathbb{M}^{m \times n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is said to be $\mathcal{S}$ -quasiconvex if for each smooth $\mathbb{T}^n$ -periodic matrix field $B : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{M}^{m \times n}$ such that $\text{Div} B = 0$, the following inequality holds:

$$(1.1) \quad \int_{\mathbb{T}^n} f(B) dx \geq f \left(\int_{\mathbb{T}^n} B dx \right).$$

The symbol Div in the Definition 1.1 denotes the operator which acts as the divergence on each row of the matrix field B . While quasiconvexity implies convexity along rank-one lines, it is easily checked that $\mathcal{S}$ -quasiconvexity implies convexity along rank- $(n-1)$ lines. Indeed if a function f is $\mathcal{S}$ -quasiconvex, then $t \rightarrow f(A + tV)$ is convex for every $A, V \in \mathbb{M}^{m \times n}$ with $\text{rank}(V) \leq n-1$. Our aim in this note is to show that rank- $(n-1)$ convexity does not imply $\mathcal{S}$ -quasiconvexity in $\mathbb{M}^{m \times n}$, for $m \geq n+1 \geq 4$. More precisely we prove the following result.

Theorem 1.2. For all $n \geq 3$ and $m \geq n+1$, there exists $F : \mathbb{M}^{m \times n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that F is rank- $(n-1)$ convex but not $\mathcal{S}$ -quasiconvex.

The proof of Theorem 1.2 is essentially based on the Šverák's counterexample adapted to the solenoidal setting and is reminiscent of an example given by Tartar in connection with a theorem in compensated compactness (see [6], pp. 185–6).

We do not know whether $\mathcal{S}$ -quasiconvexity and rank- $(n-1)$ convexity are equivalent in the case when $m = n$. Nevertheless Müller's result on quasiconvexity on diagonal matrices extends as well to the divergence free fields. If we identify the space $D(n)$ of diagonal $n \times n$ matrices with $\mathbb{R}^n$ via $y \rightarrow \text{diag}(y_1, \dots, y_n)$, then a rank- $(n-1)$ convex function on $D(n)$ may be regarded as a function on $\mathbb{R}^n$ which is convex on each hyperplane $\{y_i = \text{const}\}$, $i = 1, \dots, n$. Then, a straightforward generalization of Theorem 1 in [4] (see also Theorem 1.5 in [3]) asserting that rank-one convexity implies quasiconvexity on diagonal matrices, leads to the following statement assuring that rank- $(n-1)$ convexity implies $\mathcal{S}$ -quasiconvexity on diagonal matrices.

Theorem 1.3. Let $1 < p < \infty$. Assume that $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is convex on each hyperplane $\{y_i = \text{const}\}$, $i = 1, \dots, n$, and satisfy $0 \leq f(y) \leq C(1 + |y|^p)$. Suppose that

$$\begin{aligned} u_h^i &\rightharpoonup u_\infty^i, & \text{in } L_{\text{loc}}^p(\mathbb{R}^n) \text{ as } h \rightarrow \infty, & \quad i = 1, \dots, n, \\ \partial_i u_h^i &\rightarrow \partial_i u_\infty^i, & \text{in } W_{\text{loc}}^{-1,p}(\mathbb{R}^n) \text{ as } h \rightarrow \infty, & \quad i = 1, \dots, n. \end{aligned}$$

Then for every open set $V \subset \mathbb{R}^n$

$$\int_V f(u_\infty^1, \dots, u_\infty^n) dx \leq \liminf_{h \rightarrow \infty} \int_V f(u_h^1, \dots, u_h^n) dx.$$

We remark that, for $n = 2$, Theorem 1.3 reduces itself to Theorem 1 in [4] (in [4] the case $n = p = 2$ is considered; see Theorem 1.5 in [3] for generalization to any $n \geq 2$ and $1 < p < \infty$). Indeed, in dimension two, the notion of $\mathcal{S}$ -quasiconvexity coincides with that of quasiconvexity since any divergence free field defines a gradient field upon left multiplication by the rotation $\begin{pmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$. Therefore Šverák's example [5] shows that the conclusion of Theorem 1.2 already holds for $n = 2$.

Finally we recall that another result in the direction of Theorem 1.3 is that if f is a quadratic form and is rank- $(n-1)$ convex, then f is also $\mathcal{S}$ -quasiconvex (see [7]).

2. PROOF OF THEOREM 1.2

Theorem 1.2 is a consequence of Lemma 2.2 and Corollary 2.3 below. We will basically follow Šverák's strategy. The key idea is to find three rank- $(n-1)$ directions such that these directions

are the only rank- $(n-1)$ directions in the vector space spanned by them, which we call L . Then one defines a rank- $(n-1)$ convex function on L and seeks a divergence free field that takes values only in L and for which the inequality (1.1) is violated. The desired function F is then obtained by suitably extending the rank- $(n-1)$ convex function defined on L to the whole space. We first construct an example in $\mathbb{M}^{4 \times 3}$ and then we will extend it to $\mathbb{M}^{m \times n}$. Let $V_1, V_2, V_3 \in \mathbb{M}^{4 \times 3}$ be given by

$$(2.1) \quad V_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad V_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad V_3 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

We consider the three-dimensional subspace of $\mathbb{M}^{4 \times 3}$ generated by V_1, V_2, V_3 :

$$(2.2) \quad L := \text{span}\{V_1, V_2, V_3\} = \{\eta_1 V_1 + \eta_2 V_2 + \eta_3 V_3, \eta_1, \eta_2, \eta_3 \in \mathbb{R}\},$$

and we define the function $f : L \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ in the following way

$$(2.3) \quad \forall \eta_1, \eta_2, \eta_3 \in \mathbb{R} \quad f(\eta_1 V_1 + \eta_2 V_2 + \eta_3 V_3) = -\eta_1 \eta_2 \eta_3.$$

It can be checked that the only rank-two directions in L are given by V_1, V_2, V_3 and therefore the function f is convex (in fact linear) on each rank-two line contained in L .

Lemma 2.1. *Let L and f be defined by (2.2) and (2.3) respectively and let $P : \mathbb{M}^{4 \times 3} \rightarrow L$ be the orthogonal projection onto L . Then for each $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists $k = k(\varepsilon) > 0$ such that the function $F : \mathbb{M}^{4 \times 3} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ given by*

$$(2.4) \quad F(X) = f(PX) + \varepsilon|X|^2 + \varepsilon|X|^4 + k|X - PX|^2$$

is rank-two convex on $\mathbb{M}^{4 \times 3}$.

Lemma 2.1 is an obvious extension of Lemma 2 in [5] and therefore we refer the reader to [5] for its proof. We remark that an extension of the form (2.4) is always possible if V_1, V_2, V_3 are any three rank- $(n-1)$ directions in $\mathbb{M}^{m \times n}$ such that they are the only rank- $(n-1)$ directions in the subspace spanned by them and f is defined as in (2.3).

Lemma 2.2. *There exist $\varepsilon > 0$ and $k > 0$ such that the function F given by (2.4) is rank-two convex but not $\mathcal{S}$ -quasiconvex.*

Proof. Let $B : \mathbb{T}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{M}^{4 \times 3}$ be defined by

$$B(x) = \begin{pmatrix} \cos 2\pi x_3 & \cos 2\pi x_1 & 0 \\ 0 & \cos 2\pi x_3 & 0 \\ 0 & \cos 2\pi(x_1 - x_3) & \cos 2\pi x_1 \\ \cos 2\pi(x_1 - x_3) & \cos 2\pi(x_1 - x_3) & \cos 2\pi(x_1 - x_3) \end{pmatrix}.$$

It is readily seen that the matrix field B defined above is divergence-free and it satisfies

$$\begin{cases} B(x) \in L \quad \forall x \in \mathbb{R}^3, \\ \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} B \, dx = 0, \\ \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} f(B) \, dx = - \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} (\cos 2\pi x_1)^2 (\cos 2\pi x_3)^2 \, dx < 0. \end{cases}$$

Since B is bounded, we can choose $\varepsilon > 0$ such that

$$(2.5) \quad \int_{\mathbb{T}^3} \left(f(B) + \varepsilon|B|^2 + \varepsilon|B|^4 \right) dx < 0.$$

By Lemma 2.1 there exists $k = k(\varepsilon)$ such that the function

$$F(X) = f(PX) + \varepsilon|X|^2 + \varepsilon|X|^4 + k|X - PX|^2$$

is rank-two convex. Since $|B(x) - PB(x)| = 0$ for all x in $\mathbb{R}^3$, we have from (2.5)

$$\int_{\mathbb{T}^3} F(B(x)) dx < 0,$$

which concludes the proof. $\square$

Corollary 2.3. *For all $n > 3$ and $m \geq n + 1$, there exists $F^{(n)} : \mathbb{M}^{m \times n} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that F is rank- $(n - 1)$ convex but not $\mathcal{S}$ -quasiconvex in $L^p(\mathbb{R}^n, \mathbb{M}^{m \times n})$, for every $p \geq 1$.*

Proof. We show how to adapt the counterexample constructed in Lemma 2.2 to an arbitrary dimension n . Since one can always increase the number of rows by adding some zeros while preserving the rank of the matrices, it is enough to consider the case when $m = n + 1$. In this situation we will exhibit three matrices $V_1^{(n)}, V_2^{(n)}, V_3^{(n)}$ which satisfy the following properties

$$(2.6) \quad \text{rank}(V_i^{(n)}) \leq n - 1 \quad \forall i = 1, 2, 3,$$

$$(2.7) \quad \text{rank}(\alpha_1 V_1^{(n)} + \alpha_2 V_2^{(n)} + \alpha_3 V_3^{(n)}) = n \quad \forall \alpha \in \mathbb{S}^2 \setminus \{(\pm 1, 0, 0), (0, \pm 1, 0), (0, 0, \pm 1)\}.$$

For each α in $\mathbb{S}^2$ we set

$$M^{(n)}(\alpha) := \alpha_1 V_1^{(n)} + \alpha_2 V_2^{(n)} + \alpha_3 V_3^{(n)}.$$

We first consider the case when $n = 4$. We define $V_1^{(4)}, V_2^{(4)}, V_3^{(4)}$ as follows

$$(2.8) \quad V_1^{(4)} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad V_2^{(4)} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad V_3^{(4)} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

We have that $\text{rank}(V_1^{(4)}) = \text{rank}(V_3^{(4)}) = 3$ and $\text{rank}(V_2^{(4)}) = 2$. In order to see that the condition (2.7) is satisfied it is convenient to write the explicit formula for $M^{(4)}(\alpha)$:

$$M^{(4)}(\alpha) = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_1 & \alpha_2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \alpha_1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \alpha_3 & \alpha_2 & 0 \\ \alpha_3 & \alpha_3 & \alpha_3 & \alpha_1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \alpha_3 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Observe that the 4×3 minor of $M^{(4)}(\alpha)$ which is obtained eliminating the fifth row and the fourth column is a linear combination of the matrices V_1, V_2, V_3 defined by (2.1). Then using the fact that V_1, V_2, V_3 satisfy (2.7) for $n = 3$, one easily checks that $\text{rank}(M^{(4)}(\alpha)) = 4$. Remark that replacing the entry $M_{4,4}^{(4)}(\alpha) = \alpha_1$ by $M_{4,4}^{(4)}(\alpha) = \alpha_2$ would give another possible choice of $V_1^{(4)}, V_2^{(4)}, V_3^{(4)}$.

For $n = 5$ we choose $V_1^{(5)}, V_2^{(5)}, V_3^{(5)}$ such that $M^{(5)}(\alpha)$ is given by

$$M^{(5)}(\alpha) = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_1 & \alpha_2 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \alpha_1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \alpha_3 & \alpha_2 & 0 & 0 \\ \alpha_3 & \alpha_3 & \alpha_3 & a_{44} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \alpha_3 & a_{55} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \alpha_3 \end{pmatrix}$$

where a_{ii} can be chosen in the set $\{\alpha_1, \alpha_2\}$. Proceeding in a similar way, for every $n \geq 4$ we define the matrix $M^{(n)}(\alpha)$ such that

$$\begin{aligned} M^{(n)}(\alpha) &\in \mathbb{M}^{(n+1) \times n}, \\ M_{i,j}^{(n)}(\alpha) &= M_{i,j}^{(n-1)}(\alpha) \quad \text{for } i \leq n, j \leq n-1, \\ M_{n,n}^{(n)}(\alpha) &= a_{nn} \quad \text{where } a_{nn} \in \{\alpha_1, \alpha_2\}, \\ M_{n+1,n}^{(n)}(\alpha) &= \alpha_3, \\ M_{i,j}^{(n)}(\alpha) &= 0 \quad \text{otherwise.} \end{aligned}$$

By construction we have that $\text{rank}(M^{(n)}(\alpha)) = n$ for all $\alpha \in \mathbb{S}^2 \setminus \{(\pm 1, 0, 0), (0, \pm 1, 0), (0, 0, \pm 1)\}$. For each n we set $L^{(n)} := \text{span}\{V_1^{(n)}, V_2^{(n)}, V_3^{(n)}\}$ and we define the function $f^{(n)} : L^{(n)} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ as in (2.3), i.e., $f^{(n)}(\eta_1 V_1^{(n)} + \eta_2 V_2^{(n)} + \eta_3 V_3^{(n)}) := -\eta_1 \eta_2 \eta_3$. The sought function $F^{(n)}$ is then defined as in (2.4) with $f^{(n)}$ in the place of f and with P the orthogonal projection onto $L^{(n)}$. Considering the divergence free field $B^{(n)}(x) := \cos(2\pi x_3)V_1^{(n)} + \cos(2\pi x_1)V_2^{(n)} + \cos 2\pi(x_1 - x_3)V_3^{(n)}$, we see that $F^{(n)}$ is not $\mathcal{S}$ -quasiconvex. $\square$

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am grateful to Enzo Nesi for drawing my attention to this problem and for fruitful discussions. This work was done during my post-doc at the Max Planck Institute for Mathematics in the Sciences in Leipzig.

REFERENCES

- [1] Chaudhuri N., Müller S.: Rank-one convexity implies quasi-convexity on certain hypersurfaces. *Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh Sect. A* **133** (2003), no.6, 1263–1272.
- [2] Fonseca I., Müller S.: $\mathcal{A}$ -quasiconvexity, lower semicontinuity, and Young measures. *SIAM J. Math. Anal.* **30** (1999), no. 6, 1355–1390 (electronic).
- [3] Lee J., Müller P.F.X., Müller S.: Compensated compactness, separately convex functions and interpolatory estimates between Riesz transforms and Haar projections. *Comm. PDE*, accepted (2008). Preprint 7 (2008), Max Planck Institute for Mathematics in the Sciences, Leipzig.
- [4] Müller S.: Rank-one convexity implies quasiconvexity on diagonal matrices. *Int. Math. Research Not.* 1999, 1087–1095.
- [5] Šverák V.: Rank-one convexity does not imply quasiconvexity. *Proc. Roy. Soc. Edinburgh Sect. A* **120** (1992), no. 1-2, 185–189.
- [6] Tartar L.: Compensated compactness and applications to partial differential equations, in *Nonlinear analysis and mechanics: Heriot-Watt Symposium IV*, Pitman Research Notes in Mathematics 39, 136–212. (London: Pitman, 1979.)

- [7] Tartar L.: Estimations fines des coefficients homogénéisés, in *Ennio De Giorgi's Colloquium (Paris 1983)*, ed. P. Kree, 168–187. (Boston: Pitman, 1985.)